# Case 2:14-cv-07013 Proposition of 13

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the

purpose of initiating the civil d	ocket sneet. (SEE INSTRUC	HONS ON NEXT PAC	E OF THIS	DEFENDANTS			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Robert Arace, Barbara Arace, John Battie, Caroline Smith and Sharon			Mack	Waste Management of Pennsylvania, Inc.			
(b) County of Residence				County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant	Bucks	
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				NOTE:	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES OF IN LAND CONDEMNATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOI	CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF	
Kevin S. Riechelson, I Street, Trenton, New J	Address, and Telephone Numbe Esquire, Kamensky Cohen ersey 08608, (609) 394-85	& Riechelson, 194 S 35		Attorneys (If Known)			
Detroit, Michigan 482					DYCHO AY DA DEFING		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. CI	(For Diversity Cases Only)	NCIPAL PARTIES (PA	ace an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not	a Party)	Cit	tizen of This State		PTF DEF incipal Place	
2 U.S. Government Defendant		of Parties in Item III)	Cit	tizen of Another State	2		
				tizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	3 Soreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly) RUS		FOR BUTUREPENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	d otherstaturs • 2	
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJ		625 Drug Related Seizure	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	375 False Claims Act	
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product ☐ Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	365 Personal Injun Product Liabs 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutics	y - ility	of Property 21 USC 881 690 Other	□ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce	
150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	1	Personal Injur Product Liabii	y lity		820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark	460 Deportation     470 Racketeer Influenced and     Corrupt Organizations	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	Injury Produc	- 1		1 B40 Trademark	480 Consumer Credit	
(Excludes Veterans)	345 Marine Product	Liability PERSONAL PROI	mana 🔲	LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY  861 HIA (1395ff)	490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability  350 Motor Vehicle	☐ 370 Other Fraud		Act	862 Black Lung (923)	Exchange	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lend ☐ 380 Other Persona	~	720 Labor/Management Relations	863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal	Property Dam	age 🔲	740 Railway Labor Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 893 Environmental Matters	
196 Franchise	Injury  362 Personal Injury -	☐ 385 Property Dam Product Liabil	- 1	751 Family and Medical Leave Act		895 Freedom of Information Act	
	Medical Malpractice			790 Other Labor Litigation		☐ 896 Arbitration	
REAL PROPERTY  210 Land Condemnation	CESTL RIGIRES  440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER BEHET Habeas Corpus:	ions 🗆	791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS  870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of	
220 Foreclosure	441 Voting	463 Alien Detaine	e	niconic security Act	or Defendant)	Agency Decision	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	442 Employment	510 Motions to Va	cate		☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	950 Constitutionality of	
	443 Housing/ Accommodations	Sentence  530 General			26 USC 7609	State Statutes	
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities			MMIGRATION: E			
	Employment  446 Amer, w/Disabilities	Other:  540 Mandamus &	ı—	462 Naturalization Application 465 Other Immigration			
	Other	☐ 550 Civil Rights		Actions			
	448 Education	☐ 555 Prison Condit					
		Conditions of					
		Confinement					
	noved from [] 3 Rem	anded from ellate Court			ferred from 1 6 Multidis ner District Litigatio		
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statu	e under which you a	re filing (	Do not cite jurisdictional statut	es unless diversity):		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	28 U.S.C. 1322(d)(2)(a) Brief description of caus	e:	1)(4)			Anna de la companya del companya de la companya de la companya del companya de la	
Class Action - Odor/Trespass  VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:  CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.		N I	DEMAND \$ 15,000,000	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:		
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE: 12/10/14		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	FRECORD Lech			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	<del>,</del>	1	V	_ <u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>	
RECEIPT# AM	OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUD	OGE	

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM	
Probet Grace, Barbara Grace, CIVIL ACTION Tope Batte, Caroline Smith and :	N
Waste Haragement of PA: NO.	
In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, complaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regardesignation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.	he time of he reverse rding said I serve on
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.	( )
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.	( )
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53	3.2. ( )
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.	( )
(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)	
(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.	( )
19/0/14 Kovin Nicelelson Plaintiffs.  Attorney-at-law Attorney for	
809-394-8585 609-394-8620 Kneckelsneke	lawform.com

Telephone

**FAX Number** 

E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ROBERT ARACE, BARBARA ARACE,	)
JOHN BATTIE, CAROLINE SMITH,	)
and SHARON MACK, on behalf of	)
themselves and all others similarly situated,	)
	) Case No.
Plaintiffs,	)
	)
vs.	)
	)
WASTE MANAGEMENT OF	)
PENNSYLVANIA, INC, a Pennsylvania	)
Corporation	)
·	)
Defendant.	)
	)

# CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

#### INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiffs bring this class action against Waste Management of Pennsylvania, Inc. ("Defendant"). Defendant owns and operates the municipal solid waste landfill known as the Tullytown Resource Recovery Facility, which releases pollutants, air contaminants, and noxious odors, causing material injury to Plaintiffs' property through negligence, gross negligence and nuisance.

#### **PARTIES**

- 2. Plaintiffs, Robert Arace and Barbara Arace reside at 27 Applegate Dr., Florence, New Jersey.
  - 3. Plaintiff John Battie, resides at 42 W. Front St, Florence, New Jersey.
  - 4. Plaintiff, Caroline Smith resides at 203 Boulevard Street, Florence, New Jersey.
  - 5. Plaintiff, Sharon Mack resides at 216 Dogwood Dr., Levittown, Pennsylvania.

- 6. At all relevant times hereto, Defendant, Waste Management of Pennsylvania Inc., has been a Pennsylvania business corporation. Defendant, its agents, and its predecessors constructed, operate and/or maintain the Tullytown Resource Recovery Facility, located at 200 Bordentown Road, Tullytown, Bucks County, Pennsylvania.
- 7. At all relevant times herein, Defendant, its agents and its predecessors did and do business in Tullytown, Pennsylvania. There existed and exists a unity of interest and ownership between each of them, such that any individuality and separateness between them has ceased, and each such entity is the alter ego of each other entity.

# **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

8. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1332(d)(2)(a), §1332(d)(3), an §1332(d)(4). Jurisdiction is proper because the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and less than two thirds of the members of the putative class are citizens of the state of Pennsylvania, where Defendant is a citizen. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. 1391(b)(2), because a substantial portion of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs' claims took place in this District, and because much of the property that is the subject of this action is situated in this District.

#### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 9. On recurrent and intermittent occasions, Plaintiffs' property including Plaintiffs' neighborhoods, residences and yards have been and continue to be physically invaded by noxious odors, pollutants and air contaminants.
- 10. The noxious odors, pollutants, and air contaminants which entered Plaintiffs' property originated from the Tullytown Resource Recovery Facility located at 200 Bordentown Road, Tullytown, Bucks County, Pennsylvania ("the landfill").
- 11. It is Plaintiffs' informed belief that Defendant either constructed or directed the construction of the facilities and exercised control and/or ownership over the landfill.

- 12. The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection has received numerous complaints from residents concerning the noxious odors emitted from Defendants' landfill
- 13. The Defendant has received at least one Notice of Violation from the Department of Environmental Protection due to its emission of odors.
- 14. The invasion of Plaintiffs' property by pollutants, noxious odors, and air contaminants has caused Plaintiffs to suffer injuries including, but not limited to, exposure to pollutants, horrific odors, and air contaminants.
- 15. The invasion of Plaintiffs' property by pollutants, noxious odors, and air contaminants has interfered with Plaintiffs' use and enjoyment of their property, resulting in damages in excess of \$5,000,000.
- 16. Defendants intentionally, recklessly, willfully, wantonly, maliciously, grossly and negligently failed to construct, maintain and/or operate the landfill, and caused the invasion of Plaintiffs' property by noxious odors, air contaminants, and other airborne pollutants on intermittent and reoccurring dates.
- 17. Defendants are vicariously liable for all damages suffered by Plaintiffs, caused by Defendants' employees, representatives and agents, who, during the course and scope of their employment, allowed or failed to correct the problem(s) which caused noxious odors, and air contaminants to physically invade Plaintiffs' property.

#### **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

#### A. Definition of the Class

18. Plaintiffs bring this action individually and on behalf of all persons as the Court may determine to be appropriate for class certification, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23. Plaintiffs seek to represent a Class of persons preliminarily defined as:

# All owner/occupants and renters of residential property within a 3 mile radius of the Tullytown Resource Recovery Facility.

Excluded from the Class are Defendants and their affiliates, predecessors, successors, officers, directors, agents, servants, or employees, and the immediate family members of such persons. Plaintiffs reserve the right to modify the class definition and/or propose one or more subclasses if discovery reveals such modifications are appropriate.

# B. Numerosity

19. Upon information and belief, there are thousands of residents within a 3 mile radius of the landfill. Accordingly, the members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all parties is impracticable.

# C. Commonality

- 20. Numerous common questions of law and fact predominate over any individual questions affecting Class members, including, but not limited to the following:
  - a. whether and how Defendant intentionally, recklessly, willfully, wantonly, maliciously, grossly and/or negligently failed to construct, maintain and/or operate the landfill;
  - b. whether Defendant owed any duties to Plaintiffs;
  - c. which duties Defendant owed to Plaintiffs;
  - d. the way in which the landfill's odors were dispersed over the class area;
  - e. whether it was reasonably foreseeable that Defendant's failure to properly construct, maintain and/or operate the landfill would result in an invasion of Plaintiffs' possessory interests;
  - f. whether the degree of harm suffered by Plaintiffs and the class constitutes a substantial annoyance or interference; and
  - g. the proper measure of damages incurred by Plaintiffs and the Class.

# D. Typicality

- 21. Plaintiffs have the same interests in this matter as all the other members of the Class, and their claims are typical of all members of the Class. If brought and prosecuted individually, the claims of each Class member would require proof of many of the same material and substantive facts, rely upon the same legal theories and seek the same type of relief.
- 22. The claims of Plaintiffs and the other Class members have a common origin and share a common basis. The claims originate from the same failure of the Defendant to properly construct, maintain and/or operate the landfill.
- 23. All Class members have suffered injury in fact resulting in the loss of property value by reason of Defendant's failure to properly construct, maintain and/or operate the landfill.

#### E. Adequacy of Representation

- 24. Plaintiffs' claims are sufficiently aligned with the interests of the absent members of the Class to ensure that the Class claims will be prosecuted with diligence and care by Plaintiffs as representatives of the Class. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the Class and do not have interests adverse to the Class.
- 25. Plaintiffs have retained the services of counsel, who are experienced in complex class action litigation, and in particular class actions involving odors, including those from landfills. Plaintiffs' counsel will adequately prosecute this action and will otherwise protect and fairly and adequately represent Plaintiffs and all absent Class members.

#### F. Class Treatment Is the Superior Method of Adjudication

- 26. A class action is superior to other methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversies raised in this Complaint because:
  - a. Individual claims by the Class members would be impracticable as the costs of pursuit would far exceed what any one Class member has at stake;

- b. Little or no individual litigation has been commenced over the controversies alleged in this Complaint and individual Class members are unlikely to have an interest in separately prosecuting and controlling individual actions;
- c. The concentration of litigation of these claims in one forum will achieve efficiency and promote judicial economy; and
- d. The proposed class action is manageable.

#### **CAUSES OF ACTION I AND II**

#### PUBLIC AND PRIVATE NUISANCE

- 27. Plaintiffs restate all allegations of this Complaint as if fully rewritten herein.
- 28. The noxious odors, pollutants, and air contaminants which entered Plaintiffs' property originated from the landfill constructed, maintained and/or operated by Defendants.
- 29. The odors, pollutants and air contaminants invading Plaintiffs' property are indecent and/or offensive to the senses, and obstruct the free use of their property so as to substantially and unreasonably interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life and/or property, including in but not limited to the following ways:
  - a. causing Plaintiffs to remain inside their homes and forego use of their yards;
  - causing Plaintiffs to keep doors and windows closed when weather conditions otherwise would not so require; and
  - c. causing Plaintiffs embarrassment and reluctance to invite guests to their homes.
- 30. Defendant owed and continues to owe a duty to Plaintiffs to take positive action to prevent and/or abate the interference with the invasion of the private interests of the Plaintiffs.
- 31. By constructing and then failing to reasonably repair and/or maintain its landfill, Defendants have negligently created an unreasonable risk of foreseeable harm by causing the

invasion of Plaintiffs' property by noxious odors, pollutants, and air contaminants.

- 32. As a foreseeable, direct and proximate result of the foregoing conduct of Defendants, Plaintiffs suffered injuries and damages to their property as alleged herein.
- 33. The injuries and damages suffered by Plaintiffs are specially injurious to themselves because they uniquely suffer harm relating to the use and enjoyment of their land and property, and decreased property values, which are not harms suffered by the general public.
- 34. Plaintiffs did not consent for noxious odors, pollutants and air contaminants to enter and settle upon their land and property.
- 35. By causing noxious odors, pollutants, and air contaminants produced and controlled by Defendants to physically invade Plaintiffs' land and property, Defendants intentionally, recklessly, and negligently created a nuisance which substantially and unreasonably interfered with Plaintiffs' use and enjoyment of their property.
- 36. Whatever social utility Defendant's landfill provides is clearly outweighed by the harm suffered by the Plaintiffs and the putative class, who have on frequent occasions been deprived of the full use and enjoyment of their properties and have been forced to endure substantial loss in the value of their properties.
- 37. Defendants' substantial and unreasonable interference with Plaintiffs' use and enjoyment of their property constitutes a nuisance for which Defendants are liable to Plaintiffs for all damages arising from such nuisance, including compensatory, exemplary, injunctive and punitive relief since Defendants actions were, and continue to be, intentional, willful, malicious and made with a conscious disregard for the rights of Plaintiffs, entitling Plaintiffs to compensatory and punitive damages.

### CAUSE OF ACTION III

# **NEGLIGENCE/GROSS NEGLIGENCE**

- 38. Plaintiffs restate all allegations of this Complaint as if fully rewritten herein.
- 39. On occasions too numerous to mention, Defendant negligently and improperly constructed, maintained and/or operated the landfill such that it caused the emission of noxious odors, pollutants, and air contaminants onto Plaintiffs' homes, land and property.
- 40. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's negligence and gross negligence in constructing, maintaining and/or operating the landfill, Plaintiffs' property, on occasions too numerous to mention, was invaded by noxious odors, pollutants, and air contaminants.
- 41. As a further direct and proximate result of the foregoing conduct of the Defendant, Plaintiffs suffered damages to their property as alleged herein.
- 42. The invasion and subsequent damages suffered by Plaintiffs were reasonably foreseeable by the Defendant.
- 43. By failing to properly construct, maintain and/or operate its landfill, Defendant failed to exercise its duty of ordinary care and diligence so that noxious odors, pollutants, noise, dust, debris and air contaminants would not invade Plaintiffs' property.
- 44. A properly constructed, operated, and maintained landfill will not emit substantial odors and/or air pollutants into neighboring residential areas.
- 45. By failing to construct, maintain and/or operate its landfill, Defendant has intentionally caused the invasion of Plaintiffs' property by noxious odors, pollutants, and air contaminants.
- 46. Defendant knowingly breached its duty to exercise ordinary care and diligence when it improperly constructed, maintained and/or operated the landfill and knew, or should have known upon reasonable inspection that such actions would cause Plaintiffs' property to be invaded by noxious odors, pollutants, and air contaminants.
- 47. As a direct and proximate result of the failure of Defendant to exercise ordinary care, Plaintiffs' residences were invaded by noxious odors, pollutants, and air contaminants.

- 48. The conduct of Defendant in knowingly allowing conditions to exist which caused noxious odors, pollutants, and air contaminants to physically invade Plaintiffs' property constitutes gross negligence as it demonstrates a substantial lack of concern for whether an injury resulted to Plaintiffs.
- 49. Defendants' gross negligence was malicious and made with a wanton or reckless disregard for the lives, safety or property of Plaintiffs, which entitles Plaintiffs to an award of compensatory, exemplary, and punitive relief.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of the proposed Class, pray for judgment as follows:

- A. Certification of the proposed Class pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23;
- B. Designation of Plaintiffs as representative of the proposed Class and designation of their counsel as Class counsel:
  - C. Judgment in favor of Plaintiffs and the Class members and against Defendant;
- D. Award Plaintiffs and the Class members compensatory and punitive damages, and attorneys' fees and costs, including pre-judgment and post-judgment interest thereupon;
- E. An Order holding that entrance of the aforementioned odors upon Plaintiffs' property constituted a nuisance;
- F. Temporary, preliminary, and permanent orders for injunctive relief requiring Defendants to expeditiously repair or correct the operation of the facilities in a manner that is practically abatable and economically feasible as determined by Plaintiffs' expert, so that odors, pollutants, and air contaminants no longer invade Plaintiffs' property;
  - G. Such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

# **JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury.

Dated: December 10, 2014

KAMENSKY COHEN & RIECHELSON

KEVIN S. RIECHELSON Kamensky, Cohen & Riechelson

194 S. Broad St. Trenton, NJ 08608 (609)394-8585

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

LIDDLE & DUBIN, P.C. Steven D. Liddle (*Pro Hac Vice to be filed*) Nicholas A. Coulson (*Pro Hac Vice to be filed*) 975 E. Jefferson Avenue Detroit, Michigan 48207

(313) 392-0025

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on December 10, 2014, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the email addresses denoted on the Electronic Mail notice list, and I hereby certify that I have mailed the foregoing document or paper via the United States Postal Service to the non-CM/ECF participants indicated on the Manual Notice list.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on December 10, 2014

By: /C Rulul